

## **CAPAFR Proposed Changes to CRC Southern California Assembly District Visualizations**

The Coalition of Asian Pacific Americans for Fair Redistricting (CAPAFR) thanks the California Citizens Redistricting Commission for their time, dedication and effort in trying to respect the Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) communities of interest as they draw State Assembly, Senate, Congress and Board of Equalization districts. While the Commission has heard AAPI community testimony and reviewed our two mapping responses, we feel there are still changes that could be made to better keep our communities whole.

The district configurations proposed in the Unity Assembly plan represent our view of how the geographical integrity of AAPI communities of interest in California can properly be respected. In some areas of Southern California, the Commission's latest Assembly visualizations differ significantly from this view. The mapping suggestions we offer are intended to provide the Commission and its line-drawers with a basic idea on how, working within a less than ideal framework the Commission has decided upon for Assembly districts in some areas, it can minimize fragmentation of AAPI communities of interest or their submergence into districts with significantly dissimilar areas.

The proposed changes are submitted in response to the Commission's visualizations posted on July 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> to the Commission's website. We have heard the Commission say that no major changes will be made to these visualizations. In response to this directive, we propose a set of minor changes to specific regions, which are listed below. Each of the proposed changes requires only a two to three district population shift that is relatively minor and would not disturb neighboring regions. We hope the attached description, maps and GIS files will be helpful to both the Commissioners and Q2.

Attached are maps, shapefiles and a block assignment file that illustrate these proposed changes for Southern California. CAPAFR submitted additional proposed changes and a description for proposed Northern California changes on Friday, July 15, 2011.

### **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (SUBMITTED 7/19/11)**

#### **Los Angeles – Downtown**

CAPAFR-Los Angeles Metro appreciates the Commission's efforts to keep the five AAPI neighborhoods whole. However, the Commission's visualizations show Thai Town in a third district separate from the other neighborhoods. Thai Town is the only AAPI neighborhood not paired with an additional AAPI neighborhood in a district. Testimony submitted to the Commission highlighted the need to keep Thai Town, a low-income neighborhood, with other downtown Los Angeles neighborhoods that also share similar transportation and cultural preservation issues.

We propose that Thai Town and adjacent neighborhoods be brought into the LAELA district, which has neighborhoods more similar to Thai Town than those in the LAGBP district. This would join Thai Town with Historic Filipinotown and Chinatown. Because Thai Town is a small neighborhood, it is best placed in a district together with at least one other AAPI neighborhood to avoid submerging it in a district with less similar communities.

***CAPAFR proposed changes for Los Angeles Metro:***

Move Hollywood, Thai Town, and portions of Melrose and Hollywood neighborhoods into LAELA from LAGBP so that Thai Town is with other AAPI neighborhoods. Move Eagle Rock and Glassell Park neighborhoods from LAELA into LAGBP, placing those neighborhoods with Atwater Village. Latino CVAP remains above 50% for LAELA (57.32%) and each district remains within 1% deviation.

**Los Angeles – San Gabriel Valley**

CAPAFR-San Gabriel Valley understands that there are limitations in this area because of the presence of multiple adjacent Latino 50% CVAP districts. One major concern with the July 13 visualization is that Hacienda Heights, one of the core areas comprising the AAPI community of interest in the east San Gabriel Valley, is not paired with the similar areas of Rowland Heights, Walnut and Diamond Bar. The Commission has heard testimony about this community of interest and several Commissioners have noted that the Commission's visualization regrettably splits this community of interest. Because unifying Hacienda Heights with the rest of the community of interest would require major shifts in this region that the Commission appears to be unwilling to do at this time, we are not requesting any major changes. However, if the Commission does make changes in this region, we ask that the Commission consider the unity map lines that we proposed in this area, which placed Hacienda Heights together with the rest of the East San Gabriel Valley community of interest while placing Brea in a district with Fullerton and Buena Park.

***CAPAFR proposed changes in Los Angeles San Gabriel Valley:***

None. If major changes are required, please consider the Unity map submitted on June 28, 2011 to unify a community of interest between Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Walnut and Diamond Bar.

**Los Angeles – Los Angeles South Bay**

CAPAFR-Los Angeles South Bay appreciates the efforts of the Commission to respect the various AAPI communities in this region. The Commission's visualization keeps AAPI communities whole in the districts LAPVB, LAWBC, LAIHG and LALBS. We ask that if any changes are made, the Commission consider the unity map lines we proposed in this area.

***CAPAFR proposed changes for Los Angeles South Bay:***

None. If major changes are required, please consider the Unity map submitted on June 28, 2011.

**Orange County**

CAPAFR-Orange County appreciates the Commission's efforts to keep intact the Little Saigon community of interest residing in Garden Grove, Westminster, Fountain Valley, Midway City and the western part of Santa Ana. However, placing other cities such as Seal Beach and Costa Mesa with this community of interest risks its ability to have fair and effective representation because of differing socioeconomic characteristics and interests between Little Saigon and Seal Beach and Costa Mesa. While we prefer that the Little Saigon community of interest be placed with Stanton and a portion of Anaheim, it appears that the Commission has decided against this configuration.

Because no major shifts are being considered by the Commission in this area, we propose a discrete two-district swap that moves a portion of Huntington Beach adjacent to Westminster and Fountain Valley from CSTOC into WESTC, and moves Seal Beach and Costa Mesa from WESTC into CSTOC. The Vietnamese American communities in Westminster and Fountain Valley are more similar to the neighborhoods in Huntington Beach than they are to Costa Mesa and Seal Beach. The boundaries between Huntington Beach and Westminster and Fountain Valley are more fluid than the Seal Beach and Costa Mesa boundaries, and much of the community shares interactions across these areas. Seal Beach and Costa Mesa, however, share more in common with other coastal communities and belong in a coastal district.

We also would like to express our concern that the visualization separates Cerritos and Artesia from similar cities in North Orange County, including Fullerton, Buena Park, La Palma and Cypress. CAPAFR-Orange County members have submitted testimony noting that AAPI communities in Cerritos and Artesia are more connected to communities in the ANAFL district, sharing similar small business interests as well as other social and economic characteristics. We understand that the Commission has ruled out major changes to this region, and we are not proposing any changes. However, if any major changes are in fact to be made, we ask that Cerritos and Artesia be placed into a north Orange County district with Fullerton, Buena Park, La Palma and Cypress, as we proposed in the Unity map.

An additional major concern is the split of the city of Irvine. A cohesive city, Irvine also has the highest concentration of AAPIs in Orange County. This split will negatively affect the voice of the AAPI community in this area. While we acknowledge the Commission's position that splits of larger cities are preferable over splits of smaller cities, we take issue with the Commission's belief that it has not received much testimony asking for Irvine to be kept whole, despite the testimony of multiple CAPAFR-Orange County members asking the Commission to keep Irvine intact at the Santa Ana hearing on May 6. Because it appears that the Commission has ruled out the type of major changes that it would take to unify Irvine, we are not proposing changes to this area. However, we ask that the Commission consider the Unity map if any major changes are in fact to be made.

***CAPAFR proposed changes for Orange County:***

Bring communities in northern Huntington Beach adjacent to Westminster and Fountain Valley into WESTC from CSTOC. (See boundaries provided in the attached shapefiles and block equivalency file). Bring Seal Beach and Costa Mesa cities whole into CSTOC district from WESTC to strengthen the coastal community of interest contained in CSTOC.

**San Diego County**

CAPAFR-San Diego County appreciates the efforts the Commission has made to incorporate the Unity map into its Assembly visualization. However, a major concern is that this visualization continues to split Filipino American communities and institutions in east National City from Filipino American communities in Bay Terraces, Bonita and eastern Chula Vista. The boundary of SSAND and LMSAND in National City as proposed in the Unity map unifies this community while maintaining a 50% Latino CVAP district. We propose the Commission use the Unity map boundaries for SSAND and LSAND districts in National City to unify Filipino American

communities and institutions in east National City with Filipino American communities in Bay Terraces, Bonita and eastern Chula Vista.

Additionally, CAPAFR-San Diego asked the Commission in previous testimony to keep communities such as Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos and Rancho Bernardo in a district with other similar communities. While the Commission's visualization of the district RCHMM keeps these areas together, it also includes higher income communities such as Rancho Santa Fe and Fairbanks Ranch, which testimony from CAPAFR members has noted are dissimilar to the middle class and lower-income communities in the northern part of the City of San Diego that define the RCHMM district. Because only small changes can be made, we are proposing moving Rancho Santa Fe and adjacent unincorporated areas north into the MURTM district with more similar communities, shifting population between MURTM, ISAND and RCHMM for population equality.

***CAPAFR proposed changes for San Diego:***

1) Follow Unity map boundaries for SSAND and LMSAND districts in National City to unify Filipino American institutions and communities in east National City with other AAPI communities in LMSAND. Take additional population from Chula Vista into SSAND district for population equality. SSAND Latino CVAP is 50.77%.

2) Place City of Rancho Santa Fe and adjacent blocks (about 4,550 residents) into MURTM from RCHMM. Move part of San Diego rural area in east MURTM to ISAND for population equality. Move unincorporated blocks west of Ramona into RCHMM district.